

Dear Mr. ...

8/20/79

Reur 8/15: Thanks fo r the Becker cite, I hadnt sent up a photocopy of those pages and I've read them. Also agree with you, my copy of Green's old "maple leaf" issue, probably not a terrorist, I believe. Don't know if yet. If you see any other relevant info please let me know because - have neither time nor desire to put in emotional hip boots and walk through all the horrors. However, I think that may be the next big misinformational line and want to be prepared for it to the degree possible.

On agenda item 7, I suggest to Felt that his people can consult you (I'll carbon you).

I don't know what explains the FBI's Shaw's records. But the reference to the 1964 case is in a 1967 one, or they were looking into him at the time of the NC but did not tell it, which is what they told Clark, who in Horner's words fibbed. As of 1967 the first lead was the usual one, cover the Bureau's ass. From the obliterated reference I believe there was no ref. to Feitie and I would not expect that Shaw would associate with a Pandie. I thought I sent that to you - all I saw.

I'm not checking further than the 3rd-man note (thankin) on 90: the men in the WDCU files are Shaw and Alice and not this as.ociate of his I heard from both Core and Steele. Nor is there any indication that there were two with him at the time of the killing, only one photo. If I did not end you these notes - it will be easier to get them from Gary Stark or Earl Coiz, to whom I sent them, either or both, for a story Earl is working on. I've loaned him the Dylar film and referred him to Schaeffer for Martin, just to him. But with that kind of looseness with fact it is orders' table stuff. No editor had no real interest in finding them down. What I think you'd be wise to understand is that they came up with the conspiracy angle only because their's putdowns of all juidors kicked back. So then, in any event of what you've been told, they worked hard to avoid any possibility of coming up with anything.

No my triction on the Shaw or 3d-man records but I hope people don't do wild with Shaw in particular.

I think I'd heard before that Bradlee killed than Pearson 3/3/67 column and I can see a logical journalistic reason for it. but is there more, other reason?

On your 8/4 Mat I'd appriolate 1,2,3.

I've read all citations to 321f and 103f and find the treatment of the Army Intelligence and its destroyed records entirely inadequate. I learned easily what they omit and they omit all ref. to Powell and three ~~missives~~ records.

The re were three big J/K files any intel. destroyed plus all the records of that 112th group, except for a few at Indiantown Gap, which the committee could have gotten. So it wasn't just name files. I gave 'em what they used hoping it would suffice re c out.

I don't know thn it means anything but I can't imagine a clerk stupid enough to destroy records relating to the assassination of a treason on her own.

I'd not be surprised if at some future date "implausible microfilm" surfaces.

Sincerely,